



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/586,188

07/14/2006

Michael Glen Orchard

A0345.0026

4886

32172 7590 09/23/2009
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1633 Broadway
NEW YORK, NY 10019

EXAMINER

MABRY, JOHN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/586,188	Applicant(s) ORCHARD ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN MABRY	Art Unit 1625	

All Participants:

(1) JOHN MABRY.

(2) Brittany La.

Date of Interview: 9 September 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 3:13 pm

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
n/a

Claims discussed:
n/a

Prior art documents discussed:
n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
POTENTIAL ABANDONMENT FOR FAILURE TO RESPOND - Examiner attempted to contact Charles E. Miller at the firm DICKENSTIEN SHAPIRO. Examiner was notified by firm's docket clerk that this case had been transferred to another law firm, HOXIE & ASSOCIATES. Examiner called and talked attorney that is responsible for case, Brittany La. Examiner notified Ms. La that no response was receive in response to Restriction Requirement mailed on March 2, 2009. Ms. La told Examiner that Applicant has not sent a response. A follow up phone call was made on September 21, 2009 - message was left; no response.